



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1997

No. 34

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray, using the words of St. Francis:

"Lord, make us instruments of Your peace; where there is hatred, let us sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

"Oh, Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood as to understand; to be loved as to love, for it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGAN] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ROGAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 274(b)(2) of Public Law 104-264, the Chair appoints to the

National Civil Aviation Review Commission the following members on the part of the House:

Mr. John J. O'Connor, Philadelphia, PA;

Mr. Dr. Scott Yohe, Washington, DC.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Hon. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, March 17, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 274(b)(2) of Public Law 104-264, I hereby appoint the following individuals to the National Civil Aviation Review Commission: Col. Leonard Griggs (Retired) of Chesterfield, MO, Mr. John O'Brien of Lovettsville, VA.

Yours very truly,
RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Friday, March 14th at 4:35 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President wherein he sub-

mits a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran.

With warm regards,
ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

REPORT ON CONTINUING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-53)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, and matters relating to the measures in that order and in Executive Order 12959 of May 6, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) (IEEPA), section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c). This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 and does not deal with those relating to the emergency declared on November 14, 1979, in connection with the hostage crisis.

1. On March 15, 1995, I issued Executive Order 12957 (60 Fed. Reg. 14615, March 17, 1995) to declare a national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to IEEPA, and to prohibit the financing, management, or supervision by United States persons of the development of Iranian petroleum resources.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H1021

This action was in response to actions and policies of the Government of Iran, including support for international terrorism, efforts to undermine the Middle East peace process, and the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. A copy of the order was provided to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate by letter dated March 15, 1995.

Following the imposition of these restrictions with regard to the development of Iranian petroleum resources, Iran continued to engage in activities that represent a threat to the peace and security of all nations, including Iran's continuing support for international terrorism, its support for acts that undermine the Middle East peace process, and its intensified efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. On May 6, 1995, I issued Executive Order 12959 to further respond to the Iranian threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

Executive Order 12959 (60 Fed. Reg. 24757, May 9, 1995) (1) prohibits exportation from the United States to Iran or to the Government of Iran of goods, technology, or services; (2) prohibits the reexportation of certain U.S. goods and technology to Iran from third countries; (3) prohibits dealings by United States persons in goods and services of Iranian origin or owned or controlled by the Government of Iran; (4) prohibits new investments by United States persons in Iran or in property owned or controlled by the Government of Iran; (5) prohibits U.S. companies and other United States persons from approving, facilitating, or financing performance by a foreign subsidiary or other entity owned or controlled by a United States person of certain reexport, investment, and trade transactions that a United States person is prohibited from performing; (6) continues the 1987 prohibition on the importation into the United States of goods and services of Iranian origin; (7) prohibits any transaction by a United States person or within the United States that evades or avoids or attempts to violate any prohibition of the order; and (8) allowed U.S. companies a 30-day period in which to perform trade transactions pursuant to contracts predating the Executive order.

At the time of signing Executive Order 12959, I directed the Secretary of the Treasury to authorize through specific licensing certain transactions, including transactions by United States persons related to the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal in The Hague, established pursuant to the Algiers Accords, and related to other international obligations and United States Government functions, and transactions related to the export of agricultural commodities pursuant to pre-existing contracts consistent with section 5712(c) of title 7, United States Code. I also directed the Secretary of

the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to consider authorizing United States persons through specific licensing to participate in market-based swaps of crude oil from the Caspian Sea area for Iranian crude oil in support of energy projects in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, and Turkmenistan.

Executive Order 12959 revoked sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 12613 of October 29, 1987, and sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, to the extent they are inconsistent with it. A copy of Executive Order 12959 was transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate by letter dated May 6, 1995.

2. On March 5, 1997, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the authority for the current comprehensive trade embargo against Iran in effect since May 1995. Under these sanctions, virtually all trade with Iran is prohibited except for information and informational materials and certain other limited exceptions.

3. The Iranian Transactions Regulations (the "Regulations" or ITR), 31 CFR Part 560, were amended on October 21, 1996 (61 Fed. Reg. 54936, October 23, 1996), to implement section 4 of the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990, as amended by the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, by adjusting for inflation the amount of the civil monetary penalties that may be assessed under the Regulations. The amendment increases the maximum civil monetary penalty provided in the Regulations from \$10,000 to \$11,000 per violation.

The amended Regulations also reflect an amendment to 18 U.S.C. 1001 contained in section 330016(1)(L) of Public Law 103-322, September 13, 1994; 108 Stat. 2147. The amendment notes the availability of higher criminal fines pursuant to the formulas set forth in 18 U.S.C. 3571. A copy of the amendment is attached.

Section 560.603 of the ITR was amended on November 15, 1996 (61 Fed. Reg. 58480), to clarify rules relating to reporting requirements imposed on United States persons with foreign affiliations. Initial reporting under the amended Regulation has been deferred until May 30, 1997, by a January 14, 1997 *Federal Register* notice (62 *Fed. Reg.* 1832). Copies of the amendment and the notice are attached.

4. During the current 6-month period, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in transactions under the ITR, and issued 13 licenses. The majority of denials were in response to requests to authorize commercial exports to Iran—particularly of machinery and equipment for the petroleum and manufacturing industries—and the importation of Iranian-origin goods. The licenses issued authorized the export and reex-

port of goods, services, and technology essential to ensure the safety of civil aviation and safe operation of certain commercial passenger aircraft in Iran; certain financial and legal transactions; the importation of Iranian-origin artwork for public exhibition; and certain diplomatic transactions. Pursuant to sections 3 and 4 of Executive Order 12959 and in order to comply with the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 and other statutory restrictions applicable to certain goods and technology, including those involved in the air-safety cases, the Department of the Treasury continues to consult with the Departments of State and Commerce on these matters.

The U.S. financial community continues to interdict transactions associated with Iran and to consult with OFAC about their appropriate handling. Many of these inquiries have resulted in investigations into the activities of U.S. parties and, where appropriate, the initiation of enforcement action.

5. The U.S. Customs Service has continued to effect numerous seizures of Iranian-origin merchandise, primarily carpets, for violation of the import prohibitions of the ITR. Various enforcement actions carried over from previous reporting periods are continuing, and new reports of violations are being aggressively pursued. Since my last report, OFAC has collected a civil monetary penalty in the amount of \$5,000. The violation underlying this collection involves the unlicensed import of Iranian-origin goods for transshipment to a third country aboard a U.S.-flag vessel. Civil penalty action or review is pending against 21 companies, financial institutions, and individuals for possible violations of the Regulations.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from September 15, 1996, through March 14, 1997, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Iran are approximately \$800,000, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, The U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, and the Office of the Legal Adviser), and the Department of Commerce (the Bureau of Export Administration and the General Counsel's Office).

7. The situation reviewed above continues to involve important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals and presents an extraordinary and unusual threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United

States. The declaration of the national emergency with respect to Iran contained in Executive Order 12957 and the comprehensive economic sanctions imposed by Executive Order 12959 underscore the United States Government opposition to the actions and policies of the Government of Iran, particularly its support of international terrorism and its efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. The Iranian Transactions Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Orders 12957 and 12959 continue to advance important objectives in promoting the nonproliferation and antiterrorism policies of the United States. I shall exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 14, 1997.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GEKAS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

AGENDA OF THE 105TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to describe what the Congress has been doing and what I believe it will be doing in the near future, because as we enter the Easter recess at the end of this week, Members will be going home, and I think it is fair for our constituents to ask us where are we going, what is this Congress going to be like, and what have we achieved on behalf of the American people.

There are five basic messages that I think House Republicans in particular can take home, but a number of Democrats can agree with these messages. I think in a broad way, this is a principled bipartisanship that outlines a direction that most Americans will want to go in.

First, we have developed and unveiled a 2-year agenda, creating a better America for ourselves and our children, and I will talk about that agenda in just a moment.

Second, we are focusing on keeping our children and communities safe by winning the war on drugs as a top priority for this country.

Third, we are committed to lowering interest rates and creating better jobs by producing a balanced budget this year.

Fourth, we have as an objective ending the Internal Revenue Service as we know it. We want to help the taxpayers save time and money by providing real tax relief, simplifying our needlessly complex Tax Code, and reforming the Internal Revenue Service.

And fifth, as proof that what we are working on can be achieved, welfare reform is a success story. The 104th Congress, by passing dramatic, bold welfare reform, has made a difference and the facts prove it. That gives us reason to hope that we are going to be able to work in 1997 and 1998 on other reforms that will be of similar importance. There, I might mention education as an example of an area that we truly want to work on.

Let me start by describing the agenda that will create a better America for ourselves and our children. The House Republican majority, led by the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas, DICK ARMEY, and by the policy chairman, the gentleman from California CHRIS COX, developed a number of items which we believe will outline for the country 13 major areas of improvement. I would like to outline the steps we are taking, because I think they illustrate a firm, balanced agenda for developing a better future.

The first area is balancing the budget. We believe it is vital to pass a balanced budget amendment. We were saddened to see the other body fail by one vote, but we believe at an appropriate time this House should bring up the balanced budget amendment again, and I think if it passes in this House, as it probably will, when we send it to the other body maybe we will be developing the momentum and popular support to then get that one final vote that is missing to send it on to the States.

But a balanced budget is vital, first, because it is morally wrong for us in peacetime to spend our children's and grandchildren's money. It is just plain not right. We have the same obligation to set priorities, to set limits, to have discipline in our Federal budget that every family and every business has in their own budgets.

In addition, passing a balanced budget will lower interest rates that will improve the economy, increase the number of jobs, improve take-home pay. Think about a college student who graduates with a balanced budget. They will save over \$2,100 in repaying an \$11,000 loan over 10 years. That is over \$2,100 that that college graduate can save because interest rates will be higher lower.

Or imagine a couple buying a new house. They could save up to \$37,000 on a 30-year mortgage for an average-priced house. That is, literally they could pay for one child's college education just with the savings from a lower interest rate from a balanced budget.

Or imagine a family buying an average-priced new car. They could save \$975 over 4 years in lower interest payments on the average new-priced car.

Our point is that there is a moral case, there is a practical case, there is a self-interest case for balancing the budget. In addition, when you have deficits and you borrow more money, interest payments go up. The interest payments, when John F. Kennedy was President in the early 1960's, were about \$6 billion a year. This year the interest payment will be \$245 billion. That is, the average American will pay more in taxes to pay interest on the debt than they will pay for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps combined.

So balancing the budget ultimately leads to lower taxes through lower interest rates and less payment on the debt, and our hope would be eventually through a balanced budget to actually begin to pay down the national debt.

But this is not just a constitutional amendment. We are committed to bringing spending in line with our commitment to balance the budget by the year 2002 without raising taxes. In fact, we want to be able to focus on saving money in Government so we can lower taxes so the American people have more take-home pay and a greater ability to create new jobs and new opportunities.

We have asked the President to submit a balanced budget. The first budget that was sent up was apparently a mistake. It is about \$62 billion in deficit in the year 2002, which is our target year for balancing the budget. So we have asked the President, since he came right to this room and promised 12 times in the State of the Union, on 12 occasions he said he was for a balanced budget, he had a balanced budget plan, so we have asked him to submit a balanced budget that would allow us to begin the process of passing a balanced budget.

In addition, we believe we need to overhaul the budget process. It frankly does not work very well. We think there are steps that can be taken that allow us to control Government spending and to reduce taxes better with more cooperation between the executive branch and the Congress, and we believe that requires reforming the budget process.

Finally, we think that when the President asks for additional spending for emergencies or for overseas activities by our military, that that should be paid for at the same time we are passing it. We think that the age of credit card financing, where we just charge more and charge more and charge more, is over. If we are going to spend more money in one area, we should have the discipline to set priorities and spend less money in another area, so we are going to insist that supplemental spending bills be paid for on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Our second goal after balancing the budget is to improve learning for all

Americans. I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania BILL GOODLING, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce, which is doing a tremendous job in a project called Operation Crossroads.

They are looking at all the Federal programs for education, they are looking at, with the oversight subcommittee chairman, with the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan, PETE HOEKSTRA, they are going out and have already held nine hearings asking what works; where are the best schools in America? Where is the best inner city school for poor children? Where are the best charter schools? Where is the best math education? Where is the best science education?

They are trying to determine how can we improve Federal education assistance so we get more resources to teachers and students for classroom learning while keeping fewer resources in Washington.

□ 1415

Our goal is to help the teacher in the classroom and the student in the classroom rather than to build more and more bureaucracies. We believe that by this examination in Operation Crossroads of what works and what does not, we can begin to sort out the Federal programs.

There are approximately 720 Federal education programs. They spend about, they have spent over the years over \$539 billion in education. Our goal is to shrink the number of bureaucrats in Washington, take the savings, get them back home to the local school district, have them spent with the local student and the local teacher so that the parent, the student, and the teacher are affecting education.

In addition, one of our goals is to enhance local and parental control of education. It is very important to recognize that real learning occurs where the student is. It does not occur at the State department of education. It does not occur at some regional office. It does not occur at the Federal department in Washington. It occurs in the school where the teachers are and it occurs at home. That is why we think it is important to strengthen parents and we think it is important to strengthen local control so that people who actually have hands-on experience with the students are in a position to work in education.

Finally, we intend to cut education redtape and excessive bureaucracy and work with local teachers to help children master the basics. We think it is very important, and we agree with the President when he said that every child should be able to read by 8 years of age. We would have added they should be able to read English, which would save a great deal of money on bilingual education. We think it is important for every American child to have an opportunity to participate in the fullness of our culture, to be able to get the best

possible jobs. We think that requires mastering English, and we think that requires a focus on reading and on writing and on basic math. We think every child at a fairly early age should be able to go to the store and buy something without being cheated because they are able to do the math to check exactly what they were charged and what they paid.

We also believe that by focusing on the basics we can strengthen young people so that they are then in a position to continue to learn all of their lives because we recognize that lifetime learning is an essential in the information age, and we recognize that every young person is going to have to grow up in a world where they may have seven or eight or nine jobs in the course of their lifetime. Each of those jobs is going to require new learning and new experiences. They may move to many cities. Those are going to require new learning and new experiences.

So we are committed to lifetime learning. We believe you begin by examining, out of the 720 Federal programs, which ones work, which ones fail, which ones have too many bureaucrats in Washington, how can we shrink the amount of redtape, get the money back home and help teachers and students and parents where the real learning occurs.

Our third goal is to strengthen America's families. First we want to pass the Working Families Flexibility Act, which will permit working mothers and fathers to take time off using overtime for family and medical emergencies and other personal needs. This essentially recognizes that in the modern age very often people want time as much as they want money. It allows you to earn 1½ times off or 1½ times income, whichever you want. So if somebody has a need to go and see their child in the ballet or go visit with the teacher or be in a situation where they need to go take care of a parent who might have a health problem, this program, the Working Families Flexibility Act, would allow people to take their overtime and turn it into time off, more free time to be with their family if that is what they prefer.

If they prefer to continue to get paid time and a half in cash, they could get paid. This creates greater flexibility and greater choice for workers and allows families to decide which do they need more, more money or more time. We believe that the Working Families Flexibility Act is a key step in the right direction.

In addition, we will take steps to end partial birth abortions. It is very clear from the testimony we have had in the last few weeks that many Members of Congress were misinformed a year ago when one of the leading advocates of abortion suggested that partial birth abortions, these are abortions performed very late in pregnancy and they are performed in a way that the child is basically born except for their head

and then their brains are taken out. It is a very gruesome procedure, and it is one which virtually no one defends. Yet we had been told it was very rare; it happened only in very unusual cases. Now we have had testimony that that information was false, that in fact it is fairly common and it often happens involving healthy babies and healthy mothers. We believe it is important when a child is that close to being born that they be protected and that this particular procedure, which is particularly gruesome and inhuman, be ended. That vote will be, I believe, this week.

We are working to end this kind of partial birth. We also are working to expand the availability of adoptions. We think that adoption is a dramatically better answer than abortion. In the last Congress we passed adoption tax credits to give people some money to encourage them to be able to adopt a child. We are going to continue to work to have the adoption process streamlined because we believe that nothing will be better than to have someone decide that, rather than have an abortion, find a loving couple that wants to raise a child and help them in the adoption process. We also believe that helps fight child abuse and child neglect and helps take children out of foster homes and get them into homes where there are loving couples that want to adopt them.

We also believe it will strengthen American families if we protect the rights of people of faith. For too long God has been driven from the public arena. We believe it is important that people be in a position where they can talk openly about their faith and where they are not subject to religious persecution. I should note on this subject that not only is it a challenge sometimes here at home but that we have seen a tremendous upsurge in the last 5 years of religious persecution of all faiths around the world and that we have an obligation to be vigilant in our commitment to the right of people to worship God in their own way and to protect their right to worship.

We also want to strengthen America's families by protecting retirement security. We want to expand the number of individual retirement accounts that are available. We want to remove the kind of impediments that block expanded pension coverage, and we want to make sure that workers have a chance to earn greater retirement savings. Let me suggest that every citizen should look at the new program in Michigan, where Gov. John Engler has passed with the State legislature a new pension program that I think begins April 1 which allows the State employee an individual personal pension account that they control, that they invest, that they are vested in, that allows them to follow what is happening in the market and allows them to be involved in earning more money.

I think it is going to be a very big step in the right direction toward giving the pensioner control rather than

having a union-controlled pension fund or a State Government-controlled pension fund or a corporate-controlled pension fund. We are looking for ways that you can control the money you are saving for your retirement. We believe that most Americans want to have that right to be able to make sure that they are investing their money wisely so they know how much money they really have for their own retirement.

In addition, we will continue to work to make the Social Security trust fund safe and secure. It is currently sound, well into the next century. We believe it is possible to work to continue to make Social Security safe for everyone who is currently on it.

Our fourth goal is to increase family income by lifting the burden of excessive taxes from working Americans. We believe that we should eliminate if possible or at a minimum significantly reduce taxes on savings and investment. We want more jobs and better jobs. We want Americans to have the best technology and the best science in the world. That requires that we have the kind of savings and investment that allows our laboratories to produce the best, that allows our factories to buy the best, that allows new companies with new ideas to start up. That is the only way to have the highest income in the world. That is why we believe it is vital to reduce the penalty on savings and investment. We favor strongly either eliminating or significantly reducing any kind of capital gains penalty because we want people to have an incentive to save and to invest because that way they are going to create the jobs for the future so their children have even better jobs with even better take-home pay so they can save even more. That has been the cycle of prosperity that has made America work.

In addition, we want to pass tax relief that strengthens and encourages American families. We believe that it is vital for American families to have a \$500 per child tax credit. We are going to do everything we can this year to both balance the budget and move toward a tax credit for children. We think that is the best way for parents to then decide how to spend the money on their own child rather than having higher taxes to hire a bureaucrat in Washington to then decide how much of the money after their salary and expenses should go back to take care of their child. We are trying to shift resources back into the family by increasing family take-home pay.

We also believe that we should either repeal or substantially reduce death taxes. Why should someone work all of their life, build a small business or a family farm and then find the government taxes are so high that, when they die their family is going to have to sell that farm or sell that business just to pay the taxes. We think, if you work hard and you already paid taxes on the money, you should not have double taxation. We think it is wrong to say

that, if you die, that your entire family business is going to have to be sold just to pay government taxes or your entire family farm is going to have to be sold. So we believe we should dramatically reduce or if possible eliminate the death taxes.

For all Americans, we think that we should dramatically simplify tax laws in order to end the Internal Revenue Service as we know it. You may have read recently that the Internal Revenue Service had a \$4 billion computer project which failed. It turned out that, even when you spent \$4 billion, the Internal Revenue Code was so complicated that they could not make it work. I think the message is not to build a \$6 billion computer, it is to dramatically simplify the Internal Revenue Code. That is going to take some serious work. We have asked the President to submit to the Congress a proposal for tax simplification. We believe it may be possible for as many as 40 million Americans to no longer have to file their income tax. That is American taxpayers who are currently filing.

We believe it should be possible to dramatically decrease complexity so that the IRS office can give the same answer everywhere in the country. As you probably know, today if you call different IRS offices, you often get a different answer to the same question. So it is very hard to know exactly how to fill out some of the more complex parts of the code. So we are committed to dramatically simplifying the tax law in order to end the IRS as we know it and to get to a much simpler system with much less Government intrusion.

Finally, we believe the Internal Revenue Service itself should be audited. After all, it has 110,000 employees. You can compare that with the Border Patrol, which has about 5,500 employees, or with the Drug Enforcement Administration, which has about 7,400 employees. So that 110,000 people working for the Internal Revenue Service, they just failed completely with a \$4 billion computer project. And it is very clear that we need to have a thorough management audit, not just a financial audit but a management audit of exactly how the Internal Revenue Service is run and exactly why it has had these major management problems.

Our fifth goal is to improve access to quality health care. We believe it is possible for every American to have dramatically better health care because science is moving us into an era where the breakthroughs in scientific knowledge are going to be quite remarkable. The fact is the research, much of it done by the National Institutes of Health, others done by universities and private corporations, by research centers, that research is beginning to give us, in the human genome project, a level of knowledge about how humans operate which is greater than anything we have ever seen before. In fact, it is fair to say that in the next 20 to 30 years, we will have a level of knowledge that would have been un-

imaginable just 20 years ago. We are entering what one scientist called the age of molecular medicine, a period where our knowledge of our body is going to be so dramatic and our ability to look at birth defects, to look at cancer, to look at a variety of issues is going to be a dramatic change.

In that framework, we want to start by working on health care for senior citizens. We want to start by saving Medicare from impending bankruptcy. Even though we in the Congress have been talking now for 2 years about the danger of Medicare going bankrupt, we still do not have an adequate solution. We are working with the President. He has sent up some ideas. We hope if he submits a balanced budget proposal, he will have even more ideas for how to save Medicare.

We believe it is important to save Medicare by increasing the number of choices available for senior citizens so that they have the same right to choose as do their children and their grandchildren. We believe it is important to fight fraud and in part to at least experiment with giving senior citizens a financial incentive to help us fight fraud.

We believe it is important to create provider-sponsored networks where doctors and hospitals get together to compete with health maintenance organizations so we can have lower-cost, competitive choices so senior citizens are not trapped by any one kind of care. We also believe it is important to give senior citizens the same right to have a medical savings account as their children and grandchildren do. That is a program where you get a fairly high deductible. But if you take good care of yourself and if you watch your health, you get to keep all the money you save, if you do not in fact spend all of your deductible.

□ 1430

It is now being offered in the private sector. We believe it should be offered to senior citizens and that it has very many opportunities, particularly for folks who want to have more control over their own lives and who are willing to look at the cost of medical care and to look at the cost of medicine. We think there are big savings to be made through medical savings accounts.

In addition to saving Medicare so it does not go broke, we want to improve it. We believe it is important to promote wellness through enhanced disease research and to improve Medicare preventive benefits, for example, diabetes and breast cancer screening. We think it is very important to recognize that the current model of the Health Care Financing Administration, which is the Government agency that runs Medicare, does not put enough emphasis on wellness and on preventive care.

Diabetes is a topic I am particularly interested in because my mother-in-law is 81 and she is diabetic, and because she has really managed her diabetic care and she has watched her

blood sugar and she has watched her insulin, she has in fact been able to take pretty good care of herself. Yet the tragedy is that of the 16 million Americans who have diabetes, 8 million do not know it. They will not learn it until they have had it for 6 or 7 years, and they begin to get sick enough that they show up at the doctor and the doctor then tests them and discovers they have diabetes.

If we can find somebody early enough and if we can teach them how to take care of themselves, the evidence is that we may be able to save between 80 and 90 percent of the people who go blind, so that they can retain their sight and continue to see. Think of that. Think about a program where by early screening and early prevention and early education, 80 to 90 percent of the people who go blind because of diabetes would be able to keep their sight. We believe at least half the people who lose their kidneys or have severe heart disease or lose their feet to amputation, at least half would be able to avoid those problems.

Imagine you could wave a magic wand, and by preventive care and education and a focus on wellness, you could stop half the people in the next 10 years who will lose their kidneys due to diabetes. You could stop half the people who will have their feet amputated. You could save half the people who will end up in intensive care with severe heart disease.

That is the opportunity that an aggressive, active diabetes program in the short run gives us, and then beyond that, beyond the focus on prevention and wellness and education there is the opportunity for continued research at the National Institutes of Health, where I particularly want to commend Chairman JOHN PORTER who has done just a magnificent job over the last 3 years of really making sure that we continue to fund health research at the most basic levels, which is going to pay off for every American.

But to go back to diabetes, let me give just a couple of numbers because they are so startling. One out of every three American Indians suffers from diabetes. What a tremendous opportunity to improve health among American Indians by really working on preventive care and education in diabetes. Some 19 percent of the people on Medicare suffer from diabetes, and 1 out of every 4 dollars in Medicare cost is spent on people who have diabetes. It is a tremendous opportunity for a better quality of life, a tremendous opportunity to save resources for the taxpayer, and it is the right thing to do.

In addition, we want to improve the quality and coverage of Medicaid. We have been working with the Governors to develop more flexibility so each Governor can apply to their State the local solution that will let them serve the widest number of people in their State. It is important to remember this is a big country, there is no simple answer that solves everybody, and so we

have an obligation to reach out and to do everything we can to make sure that the Governors have the flexibility, so that Tennessee is different from Nevada and Maine is different from California.

Each State ought to have the opportunity to spend their Medicaid money as intelligently as possible so they can then cover more people and in particular extend coverage to children. We believe as many as 3 million children could be covered by Medicaid who currently are not covered because the system is being run too much from Washington, with too much red tape and with too many bureaucrats.

In addition to that, we believe that private citizens should have an expanded access to medical savings accounts. Right now the total number you can have in the whole country is 750,000. We think that that is an unrealistic cap. We believe if you want to have a medical savings account, which is a system where you basically pay a fairly high deductible, you are paying a much lower insurance premium because you are taking the risk of paying maybe as much as \$2,000 or \$3,000 in your deductible. But if you do not spend it, you are then in a position to put it away in a savings account so it begins to work for you and it adds up over the years.

It is getting very wide-range approval. It leads people to start to shop for their medical care. They do not automatically just go in to any doctor, automatically just take any prescription drug. They begin to look at what does it cost and where can I get it less expensively and what is at stake, just like any other marketplace, and it has a dramatic impact on cost.

We believe that it is going to be a system where people, those people who are willing to take the time, who want to engage in preventive care and wellness, and who are willing to shop for the best possible health care are going to find medical savings accounts very desirable, and we do not think that they should be limited to only 750,000 in a country of 260 million people.

Finally, we want to improve access to quality health care by modernizing the Food and Drug Administration to speed up approval of medical advances that save lives. Whether it is medical technology or medical devices, or whether it is prescription drugs or the brand new breakthroughs in biotechnology, we are entering an age of dramatic change in health care.

The faster we can get to the market, to the customer or the consumer and to the sick person, the best possible medicine, the best possible medical technology, the best possible biotechnology and the best possible medical devices, we are not only going to have better health care in America, we are also going to have a bigger American work force. Because in most of those areas, if we can get the Food and Drug Administration to certify prod-

ucts in a reasonable length of time, we have an opportunity to dramatically expand jobs in America selling better technology, better devices, better biotechnology and better medicine all over the world. We have a real interest in overhauling and modernizing the Food and Drug Administration.

Our sixth agenda goal is to increase economic growth and create more jobs through regulatory reform.

We recognize that with Washington bureaucrats engaged in regulations, many of them years and years out of date, that it is time to adopt commonsense regulatory reforms based on the principles of flexibility, consensus, private property ownership, free enterprise, local control, sound scientific evidence and the latest technology. We think that there is all too much time and money tied up in Washington red tape that could be used looking at creating more jobs, competing better in the world market, and having new scientific developments.

We want to protect the public, to make sure the Government does the policing necessary, for example, for safe food, for clean water, for a healthy environment, for public health, but at the same time we recognize that there are an awful lot of bureaucratic regulations that either are not necessary or are more expensive than their benefit, or are just outmoded. They might have made sense 25 years ago but they do not make sense today.

We want to apply sound science, we want to look at new ways of doing things, and what we want to do is have a better approach where we have the right incentive. We think it is possible to have commonsense regulatory reforms that allow small business and the private sector to create more jobs, which is particularly important, as I will discuss in a minute, when you get to welfare reform, because we need more jobs in America if we are going to take all the folks who are leaving welfare and make sure they can go into the private sector work force.

In addition, we want the money spent on scientific research and on investment in new technology and new machinery rather than on red tape and regulations, so that Americans can have the best jobs in the world with the highest take-home pay, so that we can have the best quality of life.

We are also going to work toward introducing competition into the American electricity marketplace. Just as introducing telecommunications reform over the last 10 years has brought down the cost of long distance telephones, just as we have seen competition both in airlines and in trucking bring down the cost of transportation, we believe that we can get to a marketplace where anybody who produces electricity can sell it and anybody who wants to buy it can purchase from a wide range of people.

There are a lot of hearings that have to be held, but I particularly want to commend Chairman DAN SCHAEFER of

the subcommittee that will be looking into this and Chairman TOM BLILEY of the Committee on Commerce, who are going to be leading extensive hearings into the question: Can we reduce the cost of electricity? The estimates are we could save the consumer possibly as much as \$60 billion by lowering the cost of electricity through competition. We need to look at it carefully, we need to make sure that we know what we are doing because it is a big, complicated topic, but competition in the electric marketplace might save you, the consumer, \$60 billion a year in lower electric bills, and that is something that we have to look at very, very seriously.

We also want to encourage greater competition in financial services by modernizing outdated regulations. We now live in the age of the worldwide market. We see on our television the Tokyo Exchange, the Shanghai Exchange, the Frankfurt Exchange, the London Exchange, Mexico City. We recognize that through the Internet and through international financial electronic transmissions, money moves worldwide literally in nanoseconds. A million dollars can be in New York at this second, in Hong Kong a minute later and in Seattle a minute after that.

So we need to modernize our financial services and recognize that we adopted many regulations in a different era when different things happened, but that now with the computer and the Internet we have a whole new need to rethink how we provide the best financial services at the lowest cost to maximize the American public's opportunity to use finances and to save and borrow at the lowest possible cost.

We also are encouraging State and local governments to review all existing unfunded mandates. The last Congress took a major step forward by ending future unfunded mandates. We said no longer could Congress pass a requirement, that is what a mandate is, without paying for it; that we were not going to be able to say to a local county government or a local school board or a local city or a State, "You are going to have to raise your taxes to pay for something this Congress has required but refused to pay for."

But what we did not do is go back and look at the existing mandates. So in meetings with mayors, with State legislators, with county commissioners and with governors, we have been urging them to review the current list, find the ones that make no sense, find the mandates that are very, very expensive and do not meet any kind of rational cost-benefit test, find the mandates that are based on bad science, bring them to us, and we hope this year to be able to repeal the least effective and most expensive of the unfunded mandates.

Finally, we want to ensure full compliance with the Results Act to force government to meet set performance

standards. We believe it is important that government not just measure input, how many billion dollars do we spend in a department, but that government measure output: What do we get for our money? If we have spent \$579 billion in Federal aid to education, why have scores gone down? If there are 14 different literacy programs, which ones are effective and which ones do not get the job done? If we spend \$3 billion a year on drug rehabilitation, which drug rehabilitation programs work and which ones do not? We think this is a very, very important area for us to be reviewing.

Our seventh area is to fight gang violence and drugs. We want to prevent juvenile crime and target gangs and hard core juvenile offenders, and we are working with President Clinton on a Juvenile Justice Act that we hope will lower the amount of violent crime among young people and give us a better chance to have safe neighborhoods. We also want to renew our commitment to stigmatized drug use, to say flatly, as Nancy Reagan said it, "Don't do it." "Just say no" worked.

We are challenging the news media and the commercial networks and the cable channel operators to put anti-drug ads and antidrug messages on the air. We believe we have to fight drugs on MTV and on VH-1, and we have to fight drugs at the local level with local parents and local schools.

We are also calling on the Clinton administration to provide a strategy for winning the war on drugs, and we want to restore the needed resources for the war on drugs. We passed a bill last week out of this House which draws the line very clearly. We are committed to saving our children from a drug culture which threatens to destroy them. We have had 5 straight years of increased drug use in this country. For 5 straight years, more and more young people have been using drugs, marijuana, cocaine, heroin, and the modern marijuana is much stronger, much more addictive and much more dangerous than the drug of 25 years ago.

We are faced with a great challenge. We believe it is vital to have a strategy to win the war on drugs, and we are prepared to work with the Clinton administration on winning that war.

Our eighth goal is community renewal and investment. We want to help people move from poverty to prosperity by enacting community renewal initiatives. Here I want to particularly commend on a bipartisan basis Congressmen J.C. WATTS and JIM TALENT and FLOYD FLAKE, who have worked together on a bipartisan basis to develop a community renewal initiative. I also want to commend Senator DAN COATS and CONGRESSMAN JOHN KASICH, who have developed ideas on tax credits for volunteers to be involved in volunteerism and to donate to charities, because I think it is very important that we get more money to charitable organizations, and particularly to faith-based charities which we believe have the best possible chance to help people.

□ 1445

I think it is possible to reform public housing. We think we can have dramatically better public housing where people have a better quality of life, more control over their neighborhood, a better way of living in a drug-free environment.

We want to promote home ownership so people move from public housing into an opportunity to own a home, and I am very proud of my Habitat for Humanity pin, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] is particularly to be commended for working with Habitat for Humanity, and we hope to have this summer a house that Members of Congress will build here in Washington, DC, to prove our commitment and then go back home and work back home in building houses because Habitat for Humanity is the model example. It both grows the family and builds the house. It requires people to meet a test of character and hard work. It requires them to spend a hundred hours working to help build somebody else's house. It requires them to spend 300 hours working to build their own home. It requires them to take a 20-hour course in home ownership. Habitat understands that you have to worry about the people inside the building or the building will rapidly fall into disrepair.

It is a tremendous concept, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], chairman of the housing subcommittee, are working together. Congressman LEWIS is chairman of an appropriations subcommittee, and they are working together on a range of housing reforms, and I must say that from early reports Secretary Andrew Cuomo seems to be moving in the right direction and have the right ideas, and we want to work with him in developing dramatic reform in housing in America.

We also want to increase educational opportunity scholarships, and we want to have incentives to create jobs, and to help people in the poorest neighborhoods. You cannot move from welfare to work if there is no work, and so we are looking at opportunities, including enterprise zones and tax breaks and de-regulatory steps to help small businesses and others provide more jobs in poor neighborhoods to help people move from welfare to work, and finally, as I said, we are working to promote charitable giving, both directly by saying people ought to do it and by creating a tax incentive led by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and Senator DAN COATS.

We also are working to rebuild America's transportation system to support the 21st century economy. The ISTEA legislation, the interstate transportation legislation, is very, very important. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is going to be offering some major steps in the right direction to continue

to develop, but let me say I do disagree with one thing the President said last week when he proposed toll roads on the interstate system:

I am against double taxation. Every time you buy a gallon of gasoline you are paying for the Federal highway program. Much of that money currently is hidden and not being spent in order to cover social spending that it was never designed to raise. We believe you should spend the money in the trust fund to build and modernize and repair the highways because you have already paid that tax when you paid for the gasoline. I think it is wrong to have you pay a toll tax on top of the gas tax that you are already paying.

Finally we are committed to making Washington, DC, the finest capital city in the world. Every American should want their national capital to be a city they can be proud of, and I think it is vital that we work with the citizens in Washington, D.C. and with the delegate from Washington, DC, Ms. NORTON. I commend in particular the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] who has done a tremendous job of working on this. Last year's chairman of the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], who is a former mayor and council member back home in Syracuse, has a great understanding of what was needed and did a very, very good job, and now the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], the new chairman of the DC Subcommittee of Appropriations. This is very important for every American, I believe. We should be dedicated to our national capital being a capital we can be proud of, and we should work to make sure that with the help of the local citizenry that we can reform and rebuild.

Our ninth goal is to reform the civil justice system. We think it is important that we send the signal that judges are appointed to interpret the law, not to make the law. We think the judicial activism where judges become petty dictators and they impose their opinion is dangerous and wrong. It is a violation of the constitutional separation of power. I am proud that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, is going to be holding hearings on judicial activism. It is an important topic.

In addition, we need to reduce the time, expense, and burden of using our courts. It should not be so expensive to go to court that you cannot afford it, it should not be such an inconvenience that it is a major burden, and we need to make sure that it is easy to gain access to our court system.

Finally, we should enact bipartisan product liability reform and other commonsense legal reforms, including protecting charities and local governments from abusive lawsuits. I hope we are going to be able to pass a Volunteerism Liability Protection Act before the Philadelphia summit on vol-

unteerism. It just seems to me if you go out and you are a volunteer, you should not be a target for some trial lawyer, that there ought to be reasonable protections and reasonable caps, and as long as you are not grossly negligent, you should not have any dangers at all, and there is something wrong when you try to help the Boy Scouts or help the Girl Scouts or be involved in the Salvation Army and it leads you to potential bankruptcy through some trial lawyer trying to make money off of your activities.

So we hope to pass both bipartisan product liability reform and protecting charities from abusive lawsuits.

Our 10th goal is to make our environmental protection efforts smarter and more effective. I used to teach environmental studies, and I believe deeply that we can have an effective environmental program, that we can secure biodiversity around the planet, that we can do a better job of using our resources, that we can have cleaner air and cleaner water, that we can clean up the toxic waste sites. The fact is today we are spending too much money on lawyers and too much money on bureaucrats and not enough money on engineers and not enough money on actual cleanups. We think we can reform that process so that we actually get better cleanups at lower cost faster.

We also believe we can clean up the brown fields of our cities so they can be reused to create jobs by setting proper standards and proper commonsense regulations so that our cities can use the already industrial areas rather than forcing industry to go out to new green areas and tear down existing natural areas to build new factories. We think they ought to be able to reuse the areas that already exist in our cities, and today government makes that too difficult and too complicated.

We also believe in improving our existing conservation programs. We want to save every possible endangered species. We think it can be done in a practical commonsense manner with local leadership involved in local efforts to maximize the kind of diversity that we all want for our children and grandchildren.

Our 14th goal is to rebuild a strong national defense to remain the leader of the world. We want to reverse the neglect of defense modernization, of high tech research and development and of the quality of life of veterans, service personnel, and their families. The fact is that this administration is underfunding defense, it is not modernizing the weapon systems, and it has cut the amount of money that would be spent on military service personnel and apparently has outyear cuts on veterans that will be horrendous in terms of cutting the quality of their health care and their services.

We believe it is important that American men and women in uniform be the best trained, the best equipped, and the best prepared in the world. We are able to do what we do with very

low casualties because our young men and women have the support of their country year in and year out in developing the best possible military. That requires investing in research and development and investing in defense modernization, and if we are going to keep a high quality force, they have to have a decent standard of living back home and a decent standard of living on their bases, and that requires the kind of modernization we need, for example, in terms of barracks and housing.

We also though think that you should not just salute waste because it is in uniform. We believe that it is possible to improve efficiency in defense spending and to reduce bureaucracy. We are committed, if I might say this symbolically, to reducing the Pentagon to a triangle in terms of the amount of mid-level management. We think you could have a 40-percent reduction in the mid-level managers in the Pentagon. We believe you could go to multiyear contracting and have a dramatic improvement in the ability to buy weapons, to buy fighter aircraft and ships and other things.

There is no reason to buy a complex big system 1 year at a time that makes them the most expensive possible way to do it, and so we hope we will see a major shift toward multiyear contracting so we can buy the most equipment at the lowest cost to give our men and women the best chance to survive on the battlefield of the future.

We also think it is important to expand the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to ensure peace in Europe for future generations. We strongly support having Poland and Hungary and the Republic of Czech entered as soon as possible, hopefully by July of this year. We believe that Romania certainly deserves consideration, so does Slovakia. There are a number of places that we need to look at and realize that it is important for countries that want to be free, countries that are democracies, countries that seek only the right to associate themselves with a strong defense organization to protect their freedom collectively. We have every interest in being the allies of those kinds of countries.

Finally, on defense it is vital that we protect American territory from missiles from terrorist states or from dictatorships. We need to be honest about the threat to this country. There are missiles today that can reach America and eliminate our greatest cities literally in 30 minutes. Some of those missiles are held by states that may not be favorable to us. Within a decade other countries that we know are not favorable to us are going to have similar missiles. Whether the weapon of mass destruction is nuclear or chemical or biological, we are faced with a tremendous threat in the next 20 years. The time to begin to defend America from that threat is now. Just as Britain had to have the foresight to build radar in the 1930's to survive the Battle

of Britain, the time to prepare to defend ourselves is not when the crisis occurs, not when we are blackmailed, but now. And every evidence, I think, of every independent observer is that the threat is real, it is already here and that we should be building today a national missile defense system capable of protecting the United States, capable of protecting Europe and Israel, and capable of protecting our allies in the Far East, if necessary, so that no one who has a missile can think that with impunity they can blackmail the free countries of the world.

Our 12th goal is to reform the United Nations. We believe that the United States should get full credit for its financial contributions to the United Nations, including military capabilities, facilities, local government services, and the security we provide. We believe that it is important that the American taxpayer have wasteful bureaucracy reduced at the United Nations and have the United Nations reformed in general. We believe it is important to control expanding U.N. troop deployments around the globe to ensure that U.S. troops are not placed under U.N. command and to improve the consultation with Congress.

We are in a different world than the one of our Founding Fathers. We now have real-time 24-hour a day television news on CNN. We have an ability for something to happen in minutes all around the world. And so we need a better consultation process between the executive and legislative branches if, in fact, we are going to be able to continue to have the will of the American people expressed. We support the United Nations, but we think we have every right as its largest donor to insist on reforms in return for that support.

Our 13th goal is to ensure the integrity of American elections. We have been very bothered by the number of cases of fraud, including voting by illegal aliens or voting by immigrants who are not yet legal. We have the evidence that as many as 10,000 convicted felons may have become American citizens last year, which is illegal; the evidence that there was an all-out effort in some communities to have government-funded agencies registering people who were not American citizens. We think that preventing voter fraud and ensuring the voters of an honest election is very important.

We also think that it is vital to preserve and protect the constitutional right to free speech. The efforts to make speech bureaucratic have failed. We need to really look at this question: Should the Government really have controls over what people can say? Should the Government really have the ability to tell you you cannot buy a television ad or a newspaper ad, you cannot say what you believe in? Is that not the opposite of what Americans stand for? So we are committed to protecting our constitutional rights to free speech.

We also believe that union members ought to have the right to know how much of their union dues are spent on politics and how much are spent on representation, and we believe that the political part of their dues should only be taken out voluntarily with the written permission of the union member, that they should not be coerced into automatically paying political money to pay for an ad against the opponent they are going to vote for. We think it is not the American way to have somebody have to buy ads for their own opponent, but that instead political contributions should be voluntary. We also believe citizens should be encouraged to participate in grassroots political involvement, and we would require full and timely disclosure of all campaign contributions.

So we believe that with the Internet it is now possible for every campaign at the end of business every day to file electronically all of its contributions for that day with the FEC and to have those contributions be made available to the public so that your right to know who is donating to a candidate would appear immediately and you could know that night if you wanted to look it up or the next day in the newspaper.

□ 1500

So my first theme, which was that we have a 2-year agenda, has been long because the agenda is long. Thirteen major areas:

- Balance the Federal budget;
- Improving learning for all Americans;
- Strengthening America's families;
- Increasing family income by lifting the burden of excessive taxes from working Americans;
- Improving access to quality health care;
- Increasing economic growth and creating jobs through regulatory reform;
- Fighting gang violence and drugs;
- Community renewal and investment;
- Reforming the civil justice system;
- Making our environmental protection efforts smarter and more effective;
- Rebuilding a strong national defense to remain the leader of the free world;
- Reforming the United Nations; and
- Ensuring the integrity of American elections.

That is a powerful agenda. It covers, really, the three topics that I listed as the next three, keeping our children's communities safe by winning the war on drugs, which is really, I think, one of our highest priorities. When we realize the children who are being destroyed by the drug trade, when we look at the violence that is directly related to drugs, when we look at the child abuse and the spouse abuse that grows directly out of drugs, winning the war on drugs should be as high a priority as any priority this country has.

I am very proud of the resolution we adopted last week, and of the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois,

DENNY HASTERT, in offering the amendment, which really made clear our commitment is to win the war on drugs, to work with Mexico, to work with Columbia, to make sure that everybody who is committed to fighting the drug dealers is on the same team.

As I said, we are also committed to lowering interest rates and creating better jobs by producing a better balanced budget this year; and we are committed to ending the IRS as we know it, to have tax relief, and to simplifying the tax system.

But the other item I want to spend a moment on is welfare reform. I want to take a moment because not only is it very, very important to the country, but it is proof that the Republican Congress has succeeded. The 104th Republican Congress made a major commitment to reform welfare. It took us over a year. We passed welfare reform twice, and twice President Clinton vetoed it. The third time we passed it he signed it. It ends the 61-year-old Federal entitlement to welfare, and says if you are an able-bodied adult, you should have expectations of working.

Our goal is to help people move from poverty to prosperity by moving from welfare to work. Because there was so much talk about reforming welfare, people began to hear about it on radio, on television, in the news media, and welfare recipients began to voluntarily come into the welfare offices and say to the welfare workers, I guess I am going to have to get trained. I guess I am going to have to go find a job.

In 22 States welfare caseloads have already fallen by 20 percent or more. Think about that. The bill has only been in effect since January 1, yet with the psychological momentum, the news media coverage, the conversation on the street in 22 States, they have already had a drop of 20 percent or more in the number of cases on welfare.

By the way, because we block-granted the money, we gave the States a set amount of money that allows them now to have more money per welfare family; in fact, one estimate is that there will be 56 percent more money available for the families still on welfare to help with child care, with retraining, and with job placement. So we see this welfare reform as important, not important because of the poor in terms of let us get them off welfare so we do not have to pay for it, but important for the poor because it helps them become prosperous.

Our goal is not to save the taxpayer, it is to save those in poverty. It is to make sure that every citizen has an opportunity to pursue happiness which, after all, in our Declaration of Independence, we say that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. So we are trying to get that Creator-given unalienable right to the welfare recipient so they get in the habit of going to work, they get in the habit of having a job, they get in the habit of

saving on their paycheck, they begin to acquire private property.

Then maybe they work with Habitat for Humanity or, the other pin I wear, Earning by Learning, a program to help poor children learn how to read; and in a few years they are on the road to prosperity, to becoming middle class, to becoming normal Americans engaged in the normal business of going to work and studying, and engaged in the normal process of having a home and having a better future.

We are committed. We think we proved with welfare that we can get a lot done. We are committed to continuing to work to get a lot done. I just believe, as our colleagues go home for the Easter break, that they are in a position to report on a very exciting agenda, to report on a very exciting success with welfare reform.

We are in a position to work on the Crossroads project, visiting local schools and other programs of excellence, conducting town meetings on education. We have a chance to have a school superintendent survey to establish an education advisory board to meet with our Governor and our State superintendent of education to talk about educational excellence.

I think we really have an opportunity on a bipartisan basis, and I hope every Democrat and every Republican will join in the Crossroads project, and contact Chairman HOEKSTRA and Chairman GOODLING to work on how to improve education.

I believe, based on the record of the last Congress, that we have proven that while it takes a while to get it done, if you keep working at it, it is amazing what we can get accomplished here in this Congress. We are going to build on our success with welfare reform, we are going to have more successes over the next 18 months.

I just think starting this weekend, Members have a chance during their district work period to really carry out a message of opportunity, a message of hope, and a message of working together as a team on a principled, bipartisan ship that gets good things done for America. That is my message for the Easter break that is coming up.

OUR EDUCATION CHALLENGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the issue that I wanted to specifically comment on during this hour that I have is the education challenge which the Congress has faced in the past and must continue to face.

All of the polls that we have seen over the last year, or perhaps even longer, indicate that the American people are absolutely driven with the concern and worry about the fate of our educational system. When simply

brought into a room and asked to indicate what they think the most critical problem and issue this country faces in the next several years is, without any prompting, the vast majority of the persons that are questioned answer spontaneously, the education system.

So I believe that the Congress is correct in placing a very large emphasis on the educational goals for this Nation, and certainly our President is to be commended for highlighting his commitment to education, to support reform, to make it possible for more families to send their children to higher education, to make the educational opportunities real for families all across this country.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, with the national administration committed to support of education, with our local communities already engaged in the process of educational reform, that the Congress has a very great responsibility to develop a program which enhances the educational programs for our country.

In that context, it therefore disturbs me greatly when I am confronted, as the ranking Democrat member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, with an approach that is being sponsored by the majority, which is called Education at the Crossroads: What Works and What Doesn't Work, leading to the presumed conclusion that there is so much out there in education which is funded by the Federal Government that does not work that the Congress ought to pay heed and perhaps revamp the system of educational support.

I think that completely misstates the issue, Mr. Speaker. I have been advised that at various hearings that this subcommittee has held, and I only came to this position a few weeks ago, so I did not participate in the previous hearings, I went to one a few weeks ago in Delaware, but it is my distinct impression from talking to staff and others that the people who have come to testify and to give of their views and impressions about Federal programs in their area, that the Federal programs have worked very well; and that while there are some that perhaps could be altered or changed, or the emphasis switched to something else, most of the people who have come forward have indicated that the Federal programs are working.

Fundamentally, I think it is important also to understand that by and large, most of the Federal programs for education, at least in the elementary and secondary levels, are voluntary. The school systems, the States, the districts, come forward themselves to ask for funding, and they are given, by and large, a very large latitude in determining how these funds are to be spent.

They find the target areas, they develop the programs, they manage it, and of course, they have to account for the spending. We are not in a position

to allocate funds, even though they are voluntary, without examining how they are spent. That is really the responsibility of the oversight committee, which I joined. It is our responsibility to see how the moneys are spent. What works and what does not work is legitimate, but we are confronted by a document issued by the Republican majority, consisting of about 50 pages, and the repeated scenario both on the floor here and elsewhere, suggesting that there are just too many programs. We heard the Speaker here on the floor make mention of 760 education programs.

I have no idea where they obtained this list. Someone said it was probably the Library of Congress or some other source which collected this data. But it has no bearing or very little bearing to the Office of Education and to the areas of educational responsibility assigned to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, of which I am a member.

As far as I can determine from discussions with the Department of Education, they took a look at this list of 760 programs, and any of the Members interested might obtain a copy of this very easily by calling the majority staff of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and ask for this list of the so-called 760 education programs, and they will be surprised that the majority of the programs listed here are not in the Office of Education, not in the Department of Education at all.

The Department tells me that there are 298 identifiable programs out of the 760 that is often mentioned, 298 out of 760. So why do they go around the country saying they are 760 education programs? It is simply not true.

Out of the 298 programs that the Department says are listed in this document, 114 have already been eliminated, many of them eliminated in the list that Vice President GORE and President Clinton produced at the beginning of their first term. These have been defunded, eliminated, consolidated. They do not belong on any list. So the list for the most part is totally outdated and serves no particular purpose whatsoever.

At any rate, in the 760 programs listed in this document produced by the majority party, there are 184 programs, according to the U.S. Department of Education, that are legitimately listed as functions and programs that are currently administered by the U.S. Department of Education.

What else is in here that makes up the 760? It is important to know that they have listed all research programs, for instance, all training programs, anything having to do with a study activity. For instance, in agriculture, a long list of research programs are listed as well as other kinds of training grants in that Department, totaling 33 programs.

I am not a particular expert about the Department of Agriculture, so cannot analyze the 33 programs, but my

quick look at it indicates that they are probably grants that have been issued by the Department, but they are being listed as though they were programs that have to be managed by that Department.

The National Oceanic Administration, which has to do with the study of pollution and management and resources of our marine environment, is listed with 16 so-called education programs. Most of them, perhaps, are the collection of data or research or items of that kind which are terribly important, but they do not belong on an education list.

The Defense Department has 20 programs listed in this document, a lot of it having to do with research activities that the DOD conducts: information gathering, information disseminating, training programs within the Defense Department. They are not education programs, as such.

The Energy Department has 22 items listed. The Health and Human Services has 169 programs listed in this document, and they range from child welfare programs, substance abuse, AIDS prevention programs, programs for diabetes and so forth that the Speaker was making reference to, all of the Centers for Disease Control programs of research, terribly important to this country, but not education programs.

□ 1515

Indian health has 10 items here, and the NIH, which the Speaker was commending for supporting and increasing funding because it is so vital to the future health of this country, has 48 items in here. Does the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce indicate by the listing of these 48 programs that these are excessive interventions in this area? I seriously doubt it. No one has taken the time to look through the 760 items on this list. If they did, I am sure this publication would never have been released.

We have the National Science Foundation, 16 items, Indian affairs has a score of items listed in this report, Indian health, Indian affairs under the Department of the Interior, many of them having to do with resource management, information, data collecting, health services, and so forth. The Transportation Department has 19 programs listed here. The Justice Department has 21. The Labor Department has 24, most of it having to do with job training services. Arts and Humanities has 33.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to take a look at this so-called 760 item list that has been frequently mentioned on the floor of this House and referenced by the Speaker as an indicator of the concerns that the majority has about the directions of the educational apparatus in the United States. For one, 760 programs are not in the Department of Education. At the most, 184 are. And they have to do with

elementary, secondary education, higher education, vocational education and all the things that are legitimate concerns.

So let us narrow the focus. If we wanted to truly see what is working and what is not working in education, let us refocus on the 184 programs and put away this diversionary tactic of suggesting to the American people that 760 programs are out there and that nobody knows anything about them. They are being managed by other Departments, and it is not the business of the Department of Education to go in and become the czar of all of this research, information gathering and try to manage it as a huge bureaucracy. That is absolutely antithetical to what the majority party believes anyway. They do not believe in this large type of management facility.

So this search for some kind of inquiry that would minimize the import of the Federal programs in education by suggesting that there are these 760 programs that are not being managed well is simply not true.

What we need to focus on in education is what really happens in the Federal funding mechanism. We hear a lot of criticism that the scores, the SAT scores are coming down, that the students are not performing well, that by other kinds of management or measurement techniques, the students are not doing as they should be doing and that our competitive status in the world is being threatened because education is functioning poorly.

Somehow in putting that criticism together about education and the concerns that have been expressed by parents and educators everywhere about the need for greater emphasis on quality education is lost in the debate because right now we are talking about 760 programs that really do not exist in our Department. So let us focus on what is really happening in education.

Most of the money for public education is coming from the local and State communities. It is not coming from the Federal Government. The average Federal contribution of the local-State budgets for education is somewhere around 6, 7, or 8 percent. That is all; 6, 7, or 8 percent of the total budget of the local school district or of a State is federally linked. The rest of the funds are coming from local taxes, local support or by the State governments in making contributions to the health, to the education of the children of that community. So the bulk of responsibility is in the local communities, in the management of the funds that they collect from their own taxes and from their own constituents.

The emphasis for the school-based management, the return of the management of your schools to parents and teachers and to the students arose from the fact that people felt that solutions and edicts and management suggestions coming from on top were not necessarily applicable to local school districts or even to individual schools.

And so the strength of the parent movement has suggested that parents and teachers in a local school environment ought to be given greater authority to determine the kinds of educational thrusts that the school ought to have, how it was to spend its money, what kinds of additional courses needed to be added onto the program and to individualize the budget process on a school-by-school basis.

Many areas have done this. My own State is one of the early pioneers in school-based management concepts. I believe to a large extent it has worked. The fundamental principle there is local school control. They make the decisions. So in this apparent decision to go across the country to determine what works and what does not work does not fit into this whole pattern which we have established over the last decade. A program may work well in one area, but that does not mean one size fits all and we are to take that program and try to replicate it, clone it so that everybody else follows that same pattern. That is precisely what the parent-teacher model is specifically opposed to. Every school situation is different. They may want to emphasize different areas of study or they may have different problems that they need to deal with in their school environment.

So while the search of what works and what does not work is important, it certainly is not to find that premium program, that absolutely great idea that works in one area and expect to replicate it throughout the Nation. I think that that is absolutely contrary to this whole notion of local responsibility and local decisionmaking. So our search for what works and what does not work ought to be for our own information in enabling us to determine what kinds of programs we ought to emphasize and what programs we ought to be sponsoring under the Federal auspices.

Now, in much of the discussion that I have heard on the floor presented by the chairman of my Committee on House Oversight, he frequently has a large map and he points to the bureaucracy that is suggested by this map in Washington and argues that the moneys that are being allocated to education are not being spent for the education of our children. In other words, it is not going to the classroom, it is not paying the teacher's salaries and, therefore, "It is being wasted inside the beltway in this humongous bureaucracy."

Well, a simple search of the statistics in the Department will tell us immediately that the Department of Education has probably the smallest overhead manpower pool of any Cabinet position in any of the recent administrations. The Secretary tells me that roughly about 2 percent of the moneys that pass through the U.S. Department of Education is spent in personnel in Washington for the management and administration of the funding process. That is a very small amount of money.

So second, I want to debunk this idea that the moneys that the Congress has appropriated for education is somehow being wasted, on 760 programs, because that is not true; and second, in the overly heavy administration or bureaucratic mechanism somehow in place here in Washington. It is not true and I invite Members to look at the details and arrive at their own judgment.

The budget process is extremely important, and I heard the Speaker again make a challenge to the President that he come back with another budget which is balanced. That is an extraordinary request. Basically what I think it does is to confess failure on the part of the majority to have their own budget to come forward which is balanced by the year 2002. That is their basic responsibility. The Constitution requires us to be the manager of the funds and revenues of this Government and to do allocations for the programs that we feel are necessary.

The President of the United States, on the other hand, merely submits his proposal. He does not enact it. We do. He proposes. He suggests how he would like to see the revenues of this country spent on the various programs that he favors. I am pleased that he came forward with very large increases for education.

I believe the President's budget will be balanced in 5 years, 2002. It is difficult for anyone sitting in this Chamber or anywhere else in the country to specifically guarantee that any budget will actually balance out because budgets that are based upon 5-year forecasts are nothing more than forecasts. They are projections. They are based upon assumptions of what the economy is going to be like next year and the year after that and the year after that, how much revenues are going to be forthcoming into the Treasury, how much unemployment there is going to be in the country that might cause a reduction in the receipts or the necessity to pay out unemployment compensation or perhaps other kinds of effects. Inflation might rear its ugly head, for instance, and diminish the strength of our economy and the gross national product might not be as vigorous as is anticipated by this administration.

They have every right to be proud of the projections they have made over the past 4 years. Their projections were always criticized as being too rosy, too affirmative in terms of what the outlooks were going to be down the road 4 or 5 years. But it has turned out that the administration's budgetary forecasts have been very conservative and that the deficits which they projected were far too high. In fact, the actual deficits were far below what they even thought it would be.

Consequently, to attack the President's budget document because it does not balance in the year 2002 is quite an incredulous performance and really, I think, confesses the absence of the majority party to have their own document forthcoming.

Under the statute which governs the budget process, and we could criticize the process interminably, but the process is here and we are required to follow it, and that process says on April 15 the majority has to come forth with a budget resolution. We have yet to take it up in the committee.

In addition to serving on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I also serve on the Committee on the Budget, and so it is interesting to me that we have engaged in this banter about asking the President to come forward with another budget. He does not have to. He submitted one. He says he believes it is balanced. Even the Republican designated head of the Congressional Budget Office in a letter to the Senate said in her view the budget was basically in balance and that there would be a deficit of zero in the fifth year.

□ 1530

So the CBO having said that, it seems to me that the majority ought to accept that letter and move forward and produce their budget document for this House to consider, as it is required to do, at least by the 15th of April. We are about to go on a long recess, not due back until the 7th of April, so in that period, which is called the district work period, I hope that the leadership on the majority side will rethink their responsibility and work vigorously to produce a budget that they can defend and which is equally conservative and balances out in the year 2002. I think that is something they owe not only this body but also the American people, all that rhetoric notwithstanding.

The budget process is very complicated and subject to a lot of misunderstanding. I for one very strongly support the capital budget idea. The Speaker made reference to the fact that people manage their own family budgets and have to live within the moneys that they earn and that just as families are required to do this, the Federal Government ought to do the same. That sounds like a very simple message, but it is far from the truth.

Families do not live on the income that they earn, and that is the plain fact. Most families, if they want to own a home, go to the bank and borrow, if they want to enjoy a quality of life. They go to the bank and get a mortgage for \$300,000 or \$400,000 and enjoy a home that they will eventually pay for in perhaps 30 years. They go to the bank and borrow to make sure that the best quality education is afforded their children.

Businesses in America do not grow and expand and become prosperous on a cash balance basis. Their strength as a business is measured by their ability to go to the bank and borrow a million dollars or \$5 million to capitalize their business and expand and generate jobs and be productive. Their wealth is determined on their ability to get this capital funding in order to finance their ventures, and this borrowing extends over a fairly long period of time.

State governments, local governments also have found it necessary to borrow under a capital budget idea. My own State, for instance, has a constitutional requirement that the operating budget must be balanced, but that the State may also through its legislative branch approve the borrowing for capital improvements, roads, highways, airport facilities, a huge convention center, an oceanfront development, university structures and athletic facilities and so forth. All of these are now enjoyed by the community because the State has taken upon itself the ability to go out and sell bonds and to build these physical structures.

The Federal budget, on the other hand, is very unique. It does not have a separate capital budget, and yet we all know that a very large hunk of the Defense Department, of the space and aeronautics budget, the transportation budget, the airport budget, numerous other areas of our budgetary documents are filled with capital projects.

Why is it that the Federal Government only has to come up with the cash, pay-as-you-go concept? It seems to me that that is really the basis of our difficulty. If we truly have a zero deficit constitutional amendment, balanced budget means a zero deficit, it will completely hamstring, strait-jacket the Federal Government and its ability to go out into the market and borrow for necessary capital improvements.

I hope that a day will come when the Congress and the administration can sit down and discuss the merits of implementing a capital budget, because that is the way to go. Then I believe we could adopt a statute, an amendment, a whatever, that would require that our operating programs, year after year operating and paying for the services that the people expect of their Government, would be in a budget which is balanced and shows no deficit but would allow the Government to go out and borrow for defense purposes, for acquisition of strategic weapons, go to Mars or whatever, build the facilities of infrastructure for our highways and airports as a necessary, without confronting the overage year after year on the negative side in our budget. I think that that is the way to go and I hope that our discourse will take us at that point.

Talking about the budget, I think it is important, if I may just refer to this chart, for people to understand where we are in terms of education funding. I do not think that the vast majority of people in the country understand the significance of this diagram, but this is what we are stuck with in terms of what we can budget in our debates here in the Congress.

Defense spending, although it is discretionary and comes up to about \$266 billion, is not likely to be reduced by the Congress. It could be, theoretically, but it is basically a fixed allocation, and the chance of reducing it so that we could fund something else is very, very remote.

The interest that we pay on our past debts, which is over \$5 trillion, is also an area over which we have no control. The interest must be paid, the moneys were borrowed, and that is a Federal financial responsibility, and that is 14 percent of the budget at \$248 billion.

Social Security as part of the budget, it is a fixed requirement. It costs 21 percent of the budget. \$364 billion must be paid out to beneficiaries who are eligible in the system, and there are no ifs, ands or buts about it, it is a fixed obligation. We do not appropriate it in the budget at all. It is an entitlement.

The same is true for Medicare and Medicaid. Both of them are strict requirements for funding: Medicare at \$209 billion, which is 12 percent of the budget; Medicaid, \$99 billion at 6 percent of the budget. These are fixed requirements and their expenditures are dependent upon the number of eligible people who come in to get those services.

There are other kinds of entitlements, 14 percent, \$244 billion. Those are the retirements, civil service retirement, military retirements and other items such as that which are not part of our budget process.

This small little pie-shaped sector here is all that is left and all that we labor to appropriate in the budget process. All the rest of it is, in my view, fixed items of allocation. We are debating 16 percent of the total budget, or \$288 billion, and out of this amount, out of this \$288 billion must come all the range of services in Justice, in Commerce, in Interior, in Agriculture, in research, in NIH, in Health and Human Services, in Education and Labor. So that is where this struggle comes in terms of the budget process.

Anyone that suggests that education funding is excessive and should be cut back really has not focused on the small amount of money that is allocated for education. It is an incredibly small amount of money, something in the range of 2 percent of the funding. I had a chart here, but I seem to have misplaced it. Education funding roughly is about 5 percent of the discretionary and 2 percent of the total Federal budget. It is a very small part of the total expenditure. The total Federal budget is \$1.5 trillion, and the education budgeting as of fiscal year 1997, last year, was somewhere around \$28 billion, which is not very much.

In this education budget, you can see how the funding is allocated. Local educational agencies receive 39 percent; State educational agencies receive 13 percent; college students receive 16 percent of the total funding; institutions of higher learning, about 15.6 percent; other kinds of group agencies, 6 percent. The Federal share, and that is what the Republican Chair of the Oversight Committee is making reference to, the overhead in Washington, the Federal share of the total Department of Education outlays is a mere 1.8 percent, or roughly 2 percent of the total budget, which is the low-

est, I am told, of any Cabinet agency in the Government.

There is not an excessive bureaucracy and the funding is very low. Anyone that suggests that too much money is going into education simply has not taken a look at the overall budget. Two percent of the total budget for education is woefully inadequate.

All the discussion and the voices that you hear constantly is that education is the most important responsibility of our society, to translate to the future our children's ability to compete in business and in trade and in global interactions. If that is true, and the future of this country is to be in the hands of the children whom we have the responsibility to educate, do you not think 2 percent of the Federal budget is woefully inadequate, 5 percent of the discretionary is woefully inadequate?

So I hope in this one area, particularly in this one area, that there can be a concerted effort on both sides of the aisle to come together with a committed program of support for education. We may differ on the emphasis, but let us not waste time pointing fingers at the Department and challenging them to reduce their bureaucracy when it is the smallest of any Cabinet agency, or alleging that there are 760 programs when in fact there are only 184. Take a serious look at those 184 and see how we can expand their impact if they are good, eliminate them if they are bad, and continue on the steady march of increasing and focusing and targeting the Federal support for education on the neediest students in our country and those programs that school districts have the greatest difficulty in funding because of the excessive cost.

It seems to me we can join hands on that simple agenda and create a great deal of good for this country and make tremendous progress.

I shall join the Republicans on their hearings across the country on Education at the Crossroads, because I believe that the people who will come forth to testify will support the Federal presence in education. It is so small. It is a minutia in the totality of responsibility that local school districts have; 6, 7, 8 percent is not a great deal of the funding, and most of it is voluntary. They get to use the money in whatever capacities they deem best, and so the essence of local control and flexibility is there for them to manage.

We should listen to these school officials, because we have much to learn. We still do not know why, for instance, the National Assessment of Educational Progress report on math recently shows certain schools are very high on the list and other schools are very low. My own State scored very low, and I am distressed by seeing our State listed at the bottom quarter of the list.

□ 1545

Many educators and administrators will say, "Well, those kinds of report

cards don't mean anything. They're probably based on erroneous data or old data or whatever." That may be true, but it seems to me that if one is seriously interested in looking at what is happening to education and how the States are dealing with it, the statistics that are put forth are very important and that we ought to pay attention to it. That does not mean we have to abide by everything that is said in it, but it is certainly a lesson to heed.

The recent report that was published January 22, Education Week in collaboration with the Pugh charitable trusts, called "Quality Counts: A Report Card on the Condition of Public Education in 50 States," is a document which I urge you all to obtain and to study very carefully if you are interested in education as a student, as a parent, as a member of a board of education or in the school system as an administrator or a teacher, or someone who is an elected legislator or whatever. The materials that are contained in this educational report are very instructive. You could probably find nitpicking reasons for discarding this particular analysis or that analysis, but the tables that are presented in this report which rank each State in the performance based upon a whole range of criteria is very, very instructive.

I found it instructive trying to see where my State placed, for instance, in the math scores that were recently released under NAPE'S and found that my State ranked in the lower fourth. It is very disturbing. The best part of the report said that we probably had the highest advances in the last 6 years in terms of the scores, so that is something of a positive note. But I think we should look at these statistics and learn from them what we are doing in our schools in teaching math.

Certainly it is not the Federal Government going into the schools teaching math. We hardly ever even fund math per se. We might fund title I, which takes moneys into the economically disadvantaged school areas to try to help students in those communities, but math as such is not a Federal program as far as I can determine. So looking at math, NAPE'S has picked out one area of performance by the students, fourth grade and eighth grade. They did this 6 years ago, and they just released their report now. They do the same for reading. It is important, I think, for us to look at the reading scores and to see how one ranks.

It has in the report the average per pupil expenditure; very, very interesting to see the States that are spending a considerable amount of money and what the results are in terms of academic achievements. One of the States that I looked at was New Jersey. Their average per pupil expenditure is \$8,118. That is a very large per pupil expenditure. My own State is around \$5,000, so it is significantly larger. The report says that 60 percent of those moneys that New Jersey spends for education goes directly into instruction, contrary

to what the Republicans on my committee have alleged. This report indicates overall about 60 percent of all school funding is for instructional services.

Now we know to run a school requires a whole lot of other expenses. You have the school lunch program, you have the maintenance program, you have the building program, you have all these other extras. In some cases you might even have to have a police officer and other kinds of protective mechanisms added. So to find a school that is spending out of its \$8,118 per pupil expenditure 60 percent that goes into instruction is very, very laudatory.

Another statistic contained in this report, and you can do this for every State; in New Jersey, the percent of teachers with 25 or less students. That was 63 percent of their school population. This is another point that they need to be commended for. My State has somewhere around 40 percent only of teachers with 25 or less students. So we have a far distance to go to achieve that record.

The average teacher's salary in New Jersey is \$38,422, and it is probably one of the highest in the country. New York is a little higher. The average teacher's salary in New York is \$41,157.

So these States and communities combined are making a tremendous effort to put education at the top. People in a very derisive kind of voice say you cannot throw money at a problem and expect to solve it. In the instance of education I believe that funding education is primarily the way to improve it and to develop quality education. One way you do that is to hire teachers that are qualified to teach, and they have a chart in this report showing how many teachers in high school are not qualified to teach the subjects that they have been assigned by the system, and you can certainly predict that those students are not going to do well if the teacher is not a qualified teacher.

So the teacher enhancement program, the average teacher salary, the amount of money that is going into the system are, it seems to me, key elements for success.

Why I pick New Jersey is that 97 percent of their public high schools offer advanced placement. Advanced placement is one of the criteria used in this report to determine the kind of initiative and thrust in quality education that the school system is placing on instruction, and so the schools that are putting their money into advanced placement turn out students that excel. And so here you have New Jersey at 97 percent AP courses. New York has an 83 percent advanced placement course. So they are doing well. The average per pupil expenditure in New York is 7,173 with a teacher average salary of \$41,157.

The No. 1 ranking State in this report in terms of—excuse me, not in this report, in the NAPE'S report for 1996

on mathematics, the No. 1 scoring State, and I have to commend that State, is Minnesota. Minnesota placed first in the outcome of the examination on math for their fourth graders and for their eighth graders. So surely they must be doing something right in Minnesota, and we need to go there to see what it is so that we can inspire other school districts to do the same; not to use the example of Minnesota to force-feed a program for the rest of the Nation on a one size fits all, but to learn from the instructional program in Minnesota how it is they have done so well in the instruction of math and to excel year after year in the command their students have of this very, very important subject. Math and science together is really the path to the future if we are to be competitive with our foreign counterparts. The average teacher's salary in Minnesota is \$37,570, so that is an indication also of their tremendous support.

Sixty-four percent of the moneys that they collect and spend in education go for instruction, and their average per pupil expenditure is \$6,983.

So there is much that I commend to you in this Education Week. Let us not just look and hear the rhetoric and expect that that is the fact or that is the truth. Let us examine Education Week, look for your State's performance. There are dozens and dozens of criteria which have been used to make the evaluation, some of it more relevant to some situations and some perhaps not. But it is certainly a way to start an oversight investigation course which takes us across the country to make this examination.

The Speaker in one of his remarks made reference to the fact that we might do away with bilingual education. I take strong issue against such a proposal. Bilingual education is to teach people how to read and write and think in English. You cannot abandon this program with the expectation that by doing so and forcing students who are not proficient in English coming to the class, perhaps speaking at home in another language, to be able to accomplish and learn what they are required to learn. Performance would be disastrously lowered if we did not have this accompanying program which allows the students to make a transition from the language that they are familiar with and use at home or a language that they use outside the classrooms. To bring that language in and to make it the source of instruction for mastery of English is really the philosophy of the bilingual education.

So I hope that the Republicans will reexamine that issue and not come up for its eradication.

The House will be debating this week the matter of flexible time for families. Again the Speaker made reference to their strong belief in families first and their desire to allow families the option to take a sick child to the doctor or to go to school to discuss their children's performance in school with the

teachers and other school personnel or to take an aging parent somewhere. These are all laudable reasons for allowing people to get time from their employers to do this important work. It seems to me that employers throughout the country have that compassion and are willing to make time available. But the flex time bill, H.R. 1 that we will be debating this week, does not come close at all to this aspiration that families have for flexible time.

It seems to me it is very simple for employers to say, "OK, you have to do this for a couple of hours. You can stay late the next day." That is flexible time. There is no pay loss or anything of that kind. But H.R. 1, the compensatory time bill that is coming forth for debate, does not guarantee the employee his or her choice of the use of that extra time.

I like to refer to the bill as the repeal of Saturday and Sunday. You know under the Fair Labor Standards Act we had the guarantee that people could only be worked 40 hours a week. That meant you freed up Saturday and Sunday to be with the family. Long ago, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed, we had the feeling about families first and they ought to have time to be with their families to enjoy the family situation. If you have an employer that is going to require overtime work and not have to pay wages in time and a half and have the option of giving time and a half time off at his, the employer's, choice, this is not flexibility for the worker at all. In my committee we tried to make it more flexible, more at the option, more at the choice of the employee, but each time we offered those amendments they were struck down.

Consider yourself as an employee being asked by your employer to stay late, work Saturdays and Sundays because there is a job order that has to go out, the business is in great jeopardy if the schedule is not met. There is no way that you would turn down your employer. You would work the extra hours.

□ 1600

You would work the extra hours. You would have to be away from your family the extra hours. That is not flexible time. That is working for no compensation at all, because the offer is work overtime and at some point later you will get time and a half off at the option of the employer. That is not fair.

If it is truly family first, family flexible, then the employee ought to be able to say, well, I want to take my time and a half next week, because I want to be with my children over their Easter break. There should not be any allowance on the part of the employer to say, no, I have to decide for comp time at a later point.

Under the bill, 260 hours of compensatory time can be saved, it can be put aside for each worker. That is a total of 160 hours of work without pay, and

time and a half of that 80 hours would be the time and a half factor accumulation of 240 hours that you cannot decide when you are going to take, and the employer will have 12 months in which to decide when to give it to you. That is not flexible time. That is a diminution of quality time with your family, that is working without compensation for a promise of compensatory time off 12 months hence.

The tragedy also is that for many workers, overtime compensation at time and a half is what they depend on to be able to pay for the expenses and make ends meet. So to have a bill that will take this away would be truly a hurtful kind of legislation.

The problems with comp time also go to the whole bankruptcy issue. Compensatory time off is not wages, and therefore it does not go into the computation of Social Security benefit time earned. And if the company goes bankrupt because the company truly was in distress, and files bankruptcy, as an employee owed compensatory time, not wages, you will not get any priority payment whatsoever.

This is a bill fraught with a great deal of potential harm and damage to working families, and does not meet, absolutely does not meet, the promise of flex time and family first, which the Republicans are touting.

As a worker I want to have my Saturdays and Sundays off, and if I am required to work either an extra 2 hours or so during the week or on weekends, I want to have the absolute right to decide whether I want it in wages or whether I am willing to take it as compensatory time off, and the time off should be at my option.

If the bill can be drafted to make those assurances, I am sure that most

of us will find a happy circumstance in joining with the Republicans. But as I see it, the misfortune of so many workers under this legislation would be forced employment, no wages, and compensatory time off at the will of the employer after a 12-month period.

That I think is unfair, unjustified, and I do not want to see the Fair Labor Standards Act protection of workers' 40-hour week, and time and a half compensation, which is attributable to Social Security credits and to bankruptcy protections and all other means for determining benefits, being jeopardized under a comp time concept.

So this debate this week should be very, very lively, and I look forward to the minority side having an opportunity to debate it and to advance our objections to this proposal.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ROGAN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CANADY of Florida for 5 minutes each day, on March 18 and 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mrs. MINK of Hawaii) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LANTOS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROGAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. COMBEST.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. HYDE in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MINK of Hawaii) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. LEWIS of California in three instances.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, 1997, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by various committees, House of Representatives, during the 4th quarter of 1996 in connection with official foreign travel, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Charles Rangel	12/12	12/15	China
Commercial airfare	1,909.98	1,909.98
Committee total	1,909.98	1,909.98

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL ARCHER, Chairman, Feb. 12, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jim Kolbe	12/7	12/9	Hong Kong	776.00	(3)	776.00
.....	12/9	12/13	Singapore	1,092.00	4,229.95	5,321.95
Hon. Joe Skeen	12/5	12/6	United States	135.00	135.00
.....	12/8	12/9	New Zealand	238.00	238.00
.....	12/9	12/16	Australia	1,501.50	1,501.50
.....	12/15	12/18	United States	510.00	510.00
Commercial airfare	7,743.65	7,743.65
Frank Cushing	12/6	12/13	New Zealand	950.00	950.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare	12/12	12/15	United States		493.00						493.00
Elizabeth Dawson	10/14	10/19	Italy		1,228.00		6,112.62				6,112.62
Commercial airfare							48.00				1,336.00
James Dyer	10/14	10/19	Italy		1,228.00		3,703.85				3,703.85
Commercial airfare											1,228.00
Charles Flickner	12/1	12/3	Belarus		400.00		3,703.85				3,703.85
	12/3	12/7	Ukraine		800.00						400.00
Commercial airfare											800.00
Douglas Gregory	11/15	11/22	New Zealand/Antarctica		700.00		3,858.05				3,858.05
Commercial airfare											700.00
William Inglee	12/14	12/15	Panama		75.00		1,850.95				1,850.95
	12/15	12/17	Guatemala		378.00						75.00
	12/18	12/19	Argentina		293.00						378.00
	12/19	12/21	Chile		314.00						293.00
Commercial airfare							4,119.00				314.00
R. Scott Lilly	10/14	10/19	Italy		1,288.00						4,119.00
Commercial airfare							3,703.85				1,288.00
James Ogsbury	12/6	12/17	Antarctica		950.00						3,703.85
Commercial airfare											950.00
Timothy Peterson	12/6	12/13	New Zealand/Antarctica		950.00		5,442.95				5,442.95
	12/12	12/16	United States		684.00		82.00		120.50		950.00
Commercial airfare							6,030.62				886.50
Timothy Sanders	12/5	12/6	United States		135.00						6,030.62
	12/8	12/9	New Zealand		238.00						135.00
	12/9	12/16	Australia		1,501.50						238.00
	12/15	12/18	United States		510.00						1,501.50
Commercial airfare							7,743.65				510.00
John Shank	12/4	12/7	Romania		999.00						7,743.65
	12/7	12/8	Croatia		331.00						999.00
	12/8	12/12	Bosnia		1,404.00						331.00
	12/12	12/13	Croatia		331.00						1,404.00
Commercial airfare							3,891.55				331.00
Paul Thomson	12/6	12/13	New Zealand/Antarctica		950.00						3,891.55
	12/12	12/16	United States		684.00		82.00				950.00
Commercial airfare							6,030.20				766.00
Patricia Schlueter	11/17	11/21	Australia		1,230.00		18.00				6,030.20
	11/21	11/26	Thailand		1,018.00		186.50				1,248.00
Commercial air							7,721.35				7,721.35
Total					24,435.00		76,302.59		120.50		100,858.09
Surveys and Investigations staff:											
Albert J. Boudreau	10/5	10/10	Chile		932.50		3,746.95		91.00		4,770.45
Joseph R. Fogarty	10/11	10/17	Italy		1,117.75		3,887.75		23.80		5,029.30
Terrence E. Hobbs	10/11	10/17	Italy		1,117.75		3,887.75		91.44		5,096.94
Robert J. Reitwiesner	10/13	10/17	Italy		670.50		3,768.95		65.00		4,504.45
	10/17	10/17	United Kingdom		122.50	(³)					122.50
R.W. Vandergrift, Jr.	10/13	10/17	Italy		670.50		3,861.95		99.23		4,631.68
	10/17	10/17	United Kingdom		122.50	(³)					122.50
L. Michael Welsh	10/5	10/10	Chile		908.75		3,746.95		59.40		4,715.10
Vicki O. Williams	10/5	10/10	Chile		932.50		3,746.95		83.85		4,763.30
Committee total					6,595.25		26,647.25		513.72		33,756.22

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

BOB LIVINGSTON, Chairman, Feb. 24, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter Deutsch	10/17	10/18	Nicaragua				719.95				719.95
William F. Tyndall	11/18	11/22	Costa Rica		553.00						1,137.95
Robert Meyers	11/18	11/27	Costa Rica		1,340.00		584.95				1,924.95
Catherine Van Way	12/11	12/14	Switzerland	1,334.22	1,014.00		906.75				1,920.75
Susan Sheridan	12/9	12/14	Switzerland		1,690.00		911.95				2,601.95
Hon. Charlie Norwood	12/10	12/10	Bosnia		(³)		(⁴)				
Hon. Charlie Norwood	12/10	12/11	Hungary		(³)		(⁴)				
Hon. Charlie Norwood	12/11	12/12	Germany		(³)		(⁴)				
Committee total					4,597.00		3,708.55				8,305.55

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Lodging, meals provided by DOD.⁴ Military air transportation.

TOM BLILEY, Chairman, Jan. 31, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
David Adams	12/2	12/5	Bangladesh		500.00						500.00
	12/5	12/8	Nepal		3,724.00						724.00
	12/8	12/10	India		656.00						656.00
	12/10	12/14	Pakistan		3,699.00						699.00
	12/14	12/15	England		259.00						259.00
Commercial airfare							6,242.05				6,242.05
Paul Berkowitz	12/2	12/5	Thailand		651.00						651.00
	12/5	12/8	Vietnam		1,176.00						1,176.00

March 17, 1997

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H1037

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	12/9	12/12	Indonesia		1,482.00						1,482.00
	12/13	12/16	India		847.00						847.00
	12/17	12/18	Bangladesh		150.00						150.00
Commercial airfare			Commercial Tvl.				6,157.95				6,157.95
Hon. Howard Berman	12/10	10/13	Philippines		744.00						744.00
	12/13	10/16	Malaysia		606.00						606.00
Commercial airfare			Commercial Tvl.				3,675.95				3,675.95
Stephen Blake	12/2	12/5	Bangladesh		³ 458.00						458.00
	12/5	12/8	Nepal		³ 724.00						724.00
	12/8	12/10	India		³ 581.00						581.00
	12/10	12/14	Pakistan		³ 824.00						824.00
	12/14	12/15	England		259.00						259.00
Commercial airfare							6,242.05				6,242.05
Elana Broitman	12/15	10/18	Columbia		636.00						636.00
Commercial airfare							1,556.95				1,556.95
Frankie Calhoun	12/11	11/13	Taiwan		560.00						560.00
	12/13	11/17	Hong Kong		1,058.00						1,058.00
	12/17	11/22	China		³ 1,267.00						1,267.00
Commercial							2,845.22				2,845.22
Michael Ennis	12/2	12/5	Bangladesh		³ 456.27						456.27
	12/5	12/8	Nepal		³ 724.00						724.00
	12/8	12/10	India		³ 606.00						606.00
	12/10	12/14	Pakistan		³ 849.00						849.00
	12/14	12/15	England		259.00						259.00
Commercial airfare							6,242.05				6,242.05
Robert Hathaway	10/7	10/8	Singapore		³ 235.00						235.00
	10/8	10/16	Indonesia		1,541.00						1,541.00
Commercial airfare							5,324.95				5,324.95
Richard Kessler	10/10	10/13	Philippines			744.00					744.00
	10/13	10/16	Malaysia		606.00						606.00
Commercial airfare							4,368.95				4,368.95
Hon. Jay Kim	12/2	12/5	Thailand		651.00						651.00
	12/5	12/8	Vietnam		1,176.00						1,176.00
	12/5	12/14	Indonesia		1,482.00						1,818.32
Commercial airfare							3,991.95				3,991.95
John Mackey	10/15	10/18	Columbia		636.00						636.00
Commercial airfare							1,556.95				1,556.95
Daniel Martz	11/11	11/13	Taiwan		³ 561.00						561.00
	11/13	11/17	Hong Kong		³ 958.00						958.00
	11/17	11/22	China		³ 1,250.00						1,250.00
Commercial airfare							3,662.23				3,662.23
Denis McDonough	10/17	10/21	Nicaragua		³ 750.00						750.00
Commercial airfare							1,158.95				1,158.95
Roger Noriega	10/17	10/21	Nicaragua		³ 850.00						850.00
Commercial airfare							1,158.95				1,158.95
Steve Rademaker	10/17	10/21	Nicaragua		³ 750.00						750.00
Commercial airfare							1,158.95				1,158.95
Joseph G. Rees	10/6	10/8	Philippines		³ 496.00						496.00
	10/8	10/15	Indonesia		³ 1,541.00						4,595.95
Committee totals					31,982.27		60,276.37				92,258.64

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Represents refund of unused per diem.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Mar. 6, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Cordia Storm	11/12	11/17	Italy		1,520.00		1,220.25				2,740.25
Edward Grant	11/29	12/6	Ireland		1,105.00		1,188.95				2,293.95
Committee total					2,625.00		2,409.20				5,034.20

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman, Jan. 30, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Germany and Italy; September 29–October 6, 1996:											
John D. Chapla	9/29	10/2	Germany		524.00						524.00
	10/2	10/4	Italy		426.00						426.00
	10/4	10/5	Germany		290.00						290.00
Commercial airfare							3,212.45				3,212.45
Thomas M. Donnelly	9/30	10/2	Germany		310.00						310.00
	10/2	10/4	Italy		440.00						440.00
	10/4	10/5	Germany		290.00						290.00
Commercial airfare							3,175.45				3,175.45
Douglas C. Roach	9/29	10/2	Germany		524.00						524.00
	10/2	10/4	Italy		426.00						426.00
Commercial airfare							3,616.45				3,616.45
George O. Withers	9/29	10/2	Germany		524.00						524.00
	10/2	10/4	Italy		426.00						426.00
	10/4	10/5	Germany		290.00						290.00
Commercial airfare							3,212.45				3,212.45
Visit to Bosnia, November 22, 1996:											
Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy	11/22	11/22	Bosnia		0.00						0.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Italy, Bosnia, Hungary and Germany, November 27–December 3, 1996:											
Hon. Ike Skelton	11/27	12/1	Italy		920.00						920.00
	11/29	11/29	Bosnia		0.00						0.00
	12/1	12/2	Hungary		212.00						212.00
	12/2	12/3	Germany		168.00						168.00
Commercial airfare							501.05				501.05
Visit to the Philippines, December 5–8, 1996:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	12/5	12/8	Philippines		750.00		5,406.95				750.00
Commercial airfare											5,406.95
Visit to Panama, December 8–13, 1996:											
Hugh N. Johnston, Jr.	12/8	12/13	Panama		429.82		1,295.95				429.82
Commercial airfare											1,295.95
Visit to Korea and Japan, December 13–19, 1996:											
Hon. Robert A. Underwood	12/13	12/16	Korea		936.00						936.00
	12/16	12/19	Japan		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							405.00				405.00
Visit to Japan and Indonesia, December 21–26, 1996:											
Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy	12/21	12/23	Japan		65.50		12.00				477.50
	12/23	12/26	Indonesia		480.00						480.00
Committee total					6,451.32		17,625.30		0.00		24,076.62

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD D. SPENCE, Chairman, Jan. 31, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Louis H. Dupart	10/15	10/18	North America		724.00						724.00
Commercial airfare							682.32				682.32
Kenneth Kodama, Staff	10/26	10/30	Middle East		1,310.00		50				1,360.00
	10/30	10/31	Africa		217.00						217.00
	11/1	11/8	Asia		1,904.50						1,904.50
	11/8	11/9	Europe		309.00						309.00
Commercial airfare							5,977.95				5,977.95
Michael Sheehy	10/28	10/30	Middle East		576.00		50.00				626.00
	10/30	10/31	Africa		434.00						434.00
Commercial airfare							4,488.25				4,488.25
Hon. Porter J. Goss	11/8	11/10	Caribbean				256.95				256.95
Commercial airfare											391.00
Louis H. Dupart	11/8	11/10	Caribbean		391.00		(?)				391.00
	11/11	11/13	Central America		200.00		(?)				200.00
	11/25	11/27	Asia		350.00						350.00
Commercial airfare							8,364.95				8,364.95
Louis H. Dupart	12/2	12/6	Europe		963.00		17.48				980.48
Commercial airfare							2,684.55				2,684.55
John I. Mills	12/2	12/6	Europe		963.00		68.00				1,031.00
Commercial airfare							2,684.55				2,684.55
Hon. Bill Richardson	12/6	12/7	Europe		676.00						676.00
	12/9	12/10									
	12/7	12/9	Africa		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare							3,660.75				3,660.75
Calvin Humphrey	12/6	12/7	Europe		676.00						676.00
	12/9	12/10									
	12/7	12/9	Africa		568.00		2,278.75				568.00
Commercial airfare											2,278.75
Committee totals					10,829.50		31,264.50		0		42,094.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

PORTER J. GOSS, Chairman, Feb. 4, 1997.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2272. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a fiscal year 1998 budget amendment that would provide authority to make one-time transfers of funds totaling \$113 million necessary to implement fully the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services [ICASS] program, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b) (H. Doc. No. 105-56); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2273. A letter from the Acting Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the report of expenditures of appropriations during the period April 1, 1996 through September 30, 1996,

pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 162b; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2274. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of March 1, 1997, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 105-54); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2275. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of Section 10A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [Release Nos. 34-38387; IC-22553; File No. S7-20-96] (RIN: 3235-AC70) received March 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2276. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 97-19: Eligibility of Georgia,

Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan to be furnished defense articles and services under the Foreign Assistance Act and the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2753(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

2277. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter notifying Congress that on March 13, 1997, United States military personnel were deployed to provide enhanced security for the American Embassy in Tirana, Albania and to conduct the evacuation of certain United States Government employees and private United States citizens (H. Doc. No. 105-55); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

2278. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting

the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Circular 90-46; Introduction (DOD, GSA, NASA) [48 CFR Chapter 1] received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2279. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Gratuities (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 96-300; Item I] (RIN: 9000-AH06) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2280. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Electronic Contracting (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 91-104; Item II] (RIN: 9000-AF50) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2281. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Office of Federal Procurement Policy Letter 93-1, Management Oversight of Service Contracting (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 94-008; Item III] (RIN: 9000-AG86) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2282. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Performance Incentives for Fixed-Price Contracts (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 93-603; Item IV] (RIN: 9000-AH07) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2283. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Compliance with Right-to-Know Laws and Pollution Prevention Requirements (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 92-054B; Item V] (RIN: 9000-AH39) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2284. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Buy America Act—Construction (Grimberg Decision) (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 91-119; Item VI] (RIN: 9000-AG81) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2285. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Collection of Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions Award Data (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 95-306; Item VII] (RIN: 9000-AH02) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2286. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Allowability of Foreign Selling Costs (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 95-021; Item VIII] (RIN: 9000-AH04) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2287. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Independent Research and Development/Bid and Proposal Costs in Cooperative Arrangements (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 95-024; Item IX] (RIN: 9000-AH03) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2288. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Prompt Payment (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 91-091; Item X] (RIN: 9000-AF61) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2289. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Attorneys' Fees in GAO Protests (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 95-016; Item IX] (RIN: 9000-AH38) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2290. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contractors' Purchasing Systems Reviews (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 95-605; Item XII] (RIN: 9000-AG75) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2291. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Performance-Based Payments (DOD, GSA, NASA) [FAC 90-46; FAR Case 96-005; Item XIII] (RIN: 900-AH22) received March 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2292. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting notification that OPM has approved a proposal for the personnel management demonstration project for the Department of the Navy, submitted by the Department of Defense, pursuant to Public Law 103-337, section 342(b) (108 Stat. 2721); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2293. A letter from the Executive Director, Assassination Records Review Board, transmitting a letter notifying Congress that neither the President, nor the Office of Management and Budget has taken any position with respect to the Review Board's recommendation that its tenure be extended for 1 additional year; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Rules, House Oversight, and Government Reform and Oversight.

2294. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on National Security, Government Reform and Oversight, International Relations, Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 929. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions; with an amendment (Rept. 105-24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COBLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 672. A bill to make technical amendments to certain provisions of title 17, United States Code; with an amendment (Rept. 105-25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COBLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 908. A bill to establish a Commission on Structural Alternatives for the Federal Courts of Appeals (Rept. 105-26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCCOLLUM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 927. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for appointment of U.S. marshals by the Attorney General (Rept. 105-27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCCOLLUM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 924. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to give further assurance to the right of victims of crime to attend and observe the trials of those accused of the crime; with an amendment (Rept. 105-28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. H.R. 514. A bill to permit the waiver of District of Columbia residency requirements for certain employees of the Office of the Inspector General of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 105-29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on House Oversight. House Resolution 91. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 105th Congress; with an amendment (Rept. 105-30). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACKERMAN:
H.R. 1083. A bill to establish certain uniform rights, duties, and enforcement procedures relating to franchise agreements; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 1084. A bill to amend the provisions of title 18, United States Code, placing restrictions on the sale of handguns to require a purchaser to reveal if the purchaser is the subject of a court order of protection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:
H.R. 1085. A bill to revise, codify, and enact without substantive change certain general and permanent laws, related to patriotic and national observances, ceremonies, and organizations, as title 36, United States Code, "Patriotic and National Observances, Ceremonies, and Organizations"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1086. A bill to codify without substantive change laws related to transportation and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:
H.R. 1087. A bill to clarify the method of execution of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 1088. A bill to reauthorize appropriations for the conservation of the Washington salmon fishery through the purchase of salmon fishing licenses and fishing vessels; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 93: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 165: Mr. PICKETT, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. CONDIT.
 H.R. 166: Mr. JONES and Mr. DELLUMS.
 H.R. 167: Mr. DELLUMS.
 H.R. 168: Mr. DELLUMS.
 H.R. 235: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 383: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mr. FAZIO of California.
 H.R. 437: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.
 H.R. 505: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 553: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 638: Mr. WICKER and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 659: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 674: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 680: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. CLEMENT.
 H.R. 752: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 778: Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 779: Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 780: Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 789: Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 804: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 816: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ARCHER.

H.R. 825: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 831: Mr. HOBSON and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 838: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 872: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HORN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 897: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 955: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1046: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. CONDIT.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. FARR of California.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HORN, Mr. JONES, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BERMAN.